

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the remarks presented here.

The claims in the application are claims 1, 3, 5 to 7, 10, 12 to 22 and 36 to 48, all other claims being cancelled.

All the claims were rejected under 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph as lacking support for the terms “electrocatalyst” and “electrically conductive”.

Applicants vigorously oppose these rejections since the terms are well known to those skilled in the art. Moreover, the term “electrocatalyst” is supported by line 7 of page 7 and “electrically conductive” is not in the present claims. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.


The claims have been amended to change the term “catalyst” in the dependent claims to electrocatalyst – to be consistent and to obviate the Examiner’s objection thereto.

The prior art rejection under 35 USC 102 and 103 are no longer applicable since claims 1 and 9 have been combined and all other claims are dependent thereon. The

Examiner indicated that claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 41 to 46 were drawn to allowable subject matter.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims point out Applicants' patentable contribution and therefore, favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hedman and Costigan

  
Charles A. Muserlian #19,683  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel. #212 302 8989

CAM:mlp  
Enclosures

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

  
Charles A. Muserlian #19,683

9-15-06